| | Case 2.07-cv-00599-JCC | Document 36 Filed 07/20/07 Page 1 of 2 | |
|----------|---|--|--|
| 01 | | | |
| 02 | | | |
| 03 | | | |
| 04 | | | |
| 05 | | | |
| 06 07 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE | | |
| 08 | JOSEPH S. PIGOTT, |) CASE NO.: C07-0599-JCC-MAT | |
| | |) CASE NO.: C07-0399-JCC-MA1 | |
| 09 | Petitioner, |) ODDED DENIVING DI AINTIEE'S | |
| 10 | V. | ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'SMOTION FOR LEAVE TO | |
| 11 | RICHARD MORGAN, |) CONDUCT DISCOVERY AND) APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL | |
| 12 | Respondent. |) | |
| 13 | | | |
| 14 | Petitioner, who is incarcerated in the Prairie Correctional Facility in Appleton, Wisconsin, | | |
| 15 | has filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2254, challenging a conviction | | |
| 16 | entered against him by a Washington state court. (Dkt. #4). Respondent has filed an answer to | | |
| 17 | the habeas petition. (Dkt. #26). Petitioner has also filed a motion seeking leave to conduct | | |
| 18 | discovery and also appointment of counsel. (Dkt. #31). Respondent has filed a response to the | | |
| 19 | motion, and petitioner has filed a reply. (Dkt. #33, #35). Having reviewed the motion, response, | | |
| 20 | and reply, the Court does hereby ORDER as follows: | | |
| 21 | (1) Rule 6(a) of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases in the United States District | | |
| 22 | Courts provides that a federal court may grant leave to conduct discovery if a party shows "good | | |
| | ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S N FOR LEAVE TO CONDUCT DISCO APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL PAGE -1 | | |

| 01 | cause." See Rule 6(a), Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases in the United States District Courts. | |
|----|--|--|
| 02 | Petitioner has not met this standard. His motion seeks leave to ask the Attorney General of | |
| 03 | Washington, who is not a party to this action, questions that are either improper or irrelevant. | |
|)4 | (Dkt. #31, Ex. A). Accordingly, plaintiff's motion for leave to conduct discovery (Dkt. #31) is | |
|)5 | DENIED. | |
| 06 | (2) Petitioner's motion for appointment of counsel is the second such request made | |
| 07 | by petitioner. Previously, the Court denied petitioner's first request. (Dkt. #10). Petitioner has | |
| 08 | not presented any new legal or factual argument why counsel should be appointed. Accordingly, | |
|)9 | petitioner's motion for appointment of counsel (Dkt. #31) is DENIED. | |
| 10 | (3) The Clerk is directed to send a copy of this Order to petitioner, to counsel for | |
| 11 | respondent, and to the Hon. John C. Coughenour. | |
| 12 | DATED this <u>20th</u> day of July, 2007. | |
| 13 | $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{M}} = \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{M}} = \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{M}}$ | |
| 14 | Mary Alice Theiler United States Magistrate Judge | |
| 15 | Officed States Wagistrate Judge | |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO CONDUCT DISCOVERY AND APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL PAGE -2